

KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)
March 20, 2009
Meeting Minutes

Members in Attendance

William A. Beck
Joe Casalini
Bob Dixon
Richard Gelowicz
Joan McGilton
Suellen Mele
Ray Schlien
Relaena Sindelar
Judy Stenberg
Joe Tessier
Dave Whitley

Others in Attendance

Tim Crosby
Jane Gateley
Jerry Hardebeck
Kathy Hashagen
Sabrina Kang
Kevin Kiernan
Robert Kommer
Sean Kronberg
Grace Reamer
Thea Severn
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann
Diane Yates
Bill Ziegler

Action Items

Line 7-8: Approval of November Minutes
Line 10-11: Approval of January Minutes
Line 41-44: Election of Committee officers

1 **Call to Order and Introductions**

2 Intergovernmental Liaison Diane Yates noted that a quorum was present. SWAC Vice
3 Chair Joe Casalini called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. Everyone in attendance
4 introduced themselves.

5

6 **Approval of November Minutes**

7 **SWAC Member William A. Beck moved approval of the November minutes.**

8 *The motion was approved by consensus.*

9

10 **Beck moved approval of the January minutes.**

11 *The motion was approved by consensus.*

12

13 **Membership**

14 Open Positions

15 Yates reported on recent appointments and reappointments to SWAC.

16

17 She said that David Baker, Bob Dixon, Joan McGilton, Max Pope and Dave Whitley have
18 been reappointed. She also shared that SWAC Member Max Pope has been ill and hopes to
19 be back to the committee in the next few months.

20

21 New appointees include Jerry Hardebeck, Sean Kronberg, Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann, and
22 Bill Ziegler. Yates noted that an applicant is considered a member of SWAC 30 days after
23 the appointment letter is stamped in by the Clerk of the Council or the applicant is
24 confirmed by council, whichever comes first.

25

26 Current open positions include the citizen position resulting from SWAC Chair Carolyn
27 Armanini's resignation and the manufacturer in King County position. Casalini
28 acknowledged Armanini's work on the committee as well as her leadership, drive, and
29 humor. He said she will be missed.

30

31 Nomination and Election of Chair

32 Casalini opened nominations for Chair. SWAC member Richard Gelowicz suggested that
33 the election be deferred until the next meeting when five additional members would be
34 added to the roster. Casalini said he felt it was important for SWAC to elect a new Chair
35 today. Casalini nominated SWAC Member Judy Stenberg as Chair. Stenberg accepted the
36 nomination with reservations stating that she may miss meetings in January, May and in the
37 fall.

38

39 SWAC Member Dave Whitley nominated Casalini as Chair. Yates noted that the Chair and
40 Vice Chair positions will serve until the next regular election in September. After
41 discussion, **Casalini agreed to serve as SWAC chair and Stenberg agreed to serve as**
42 **Vice Chair.**

43

44 *The chair and vice chair were elected by a unanimous vote.*

45

46 **Financial Disclosure forms**

47 Yates said that financial disclosure forms were placed on the table for those members still
48 needing to complete them. Forms are due to the Ethics Office by April 15th.

49

50 **Updates: SWD / MSWMAC / Other**

51 SWD Updates

52 Solid Waste Division Director Kevin Kiernan said the division expects to begin the SEPA
53 process for the Cedar Hills Site Development Plan shortly. This process will review
54 potential environmental impacts of each of the five identified alternatives. SWAC members
55 will be informed of the scoping meeting planned for April.

56

57 The Solid Waste Division waived disposal fees during the recent flood events at a cost of
58 approximately \$100,000. Over 700 free disposal vouchers were issued to residents in
59 response to the flood. At this time, about 200 of the vouchers have been redeemed at a cost
60 of \$9,000. Because disposal is a function of the Solid Waste Division, FEMA will not
61 reimburse these costs. Contracting costs of \$70,000 and overtime costs incurred as part of
62 the flood response may be partially reimbursed by FEMA.

63

64 The Solid Waste Division is reviewing submittals and schedules from the contractor for
65 Phase I construction at Bow Lake. Recycling services have been discontinued at that
66 location in preparation for construction. SWD intends to continue full service to
67 commercial haulers during construction and is considering options to minimize the impact
68 on self-haul service. At a minimum, self-haul service will be available evenings and
69 weekends at Bow Lake during Phase I construction.

70

71 Kiernan noted that the division will communicate construction related changes in service at
72 Bow Lake to the neighboring cities and has begun communication with customers through
73 information at the site. Guest Tim Crosby asked how the construction is expected to impact
74 commercial service and whether the county has attempted to partner with haulers to
75 increase curbside collection. Kiernan responded that encouraging curbside collection is part

76 of the communication about the construction and that the division will work with haulers
77 when more detailed information is available about the construction schedule.

78

79 Kiernan said that tonnage has not returned to pre-2008 levels. This lower tonnage has a
80 direct impact on the budget. The impacts were absorbed in 2008 by controlling expenses
81 and significantly decreasing the number of hours worked by regular part time (RPT)
82 employees in Operations. Those practices will be continued through 2009 and are being
83 considered in preparing the 2010 budget.

84

85 SWAC Chair Joe Casalini noted that the tonnage is not being diverted into recycling;
86 people are simply not consuming as much. Kiernan noted that the decreased tonnage is
87 consistent with lower sales tax revenues. Gelowicz said that the value of recycled materials
88 has also decreased.

89

90 Kiernan noted that the Illegal Dumping Fee Waiver Ordinance has been approved by the
91 council. Through this program, effected citizens can request a voucher for free dumping of
92 waste that has been dumped illegally. There is a limited budget for the fee waivers.

93

94 There were no significant questions in response to the division's update on transfer and
95 disposal at the March 18th Regional Policy Committee meeting.

96

97 Kiernan said that the division expects to receive its first payment for landfill gas soon.
98 Though the check will be small, it is a significant milestone in the effort to convert landfill
99 gas to energy. Ingenco plans to begin commercial operations in April which will result in
100 approximately \$1,000,000 annual income to the division. SWAC members will be invited
101 to the official ribbon cutting ceremony for the plant.

102

103 Kiernan noted that the division expects to receive the draft Ernst and Young audit report in
104 April.

105

106 Kiernan said that the division has identified a list of projects for potential funding from the
107 federal stimulus package. Though the energy section of the package specifically mentions
108 recycling there is no certainty that any funding will be received.

109

110 Kiernan noted that the division expects to provide the final chapters of the comp plan for
111 SWAC review in April. There will be no comp plan chapters to review in May or June.
112 The division will discuss the possibility of cancelling SWAC meetings in those months
113 with the Chair and Vice Chair.

114

115 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford reported that 3 million
116 pounds of electronics were collected for recycling in February in the state; 37 percent of
117 that total was collected in King County. SWAC Member Suellen Mele said that the pounds
118 collected per capita were larger in some rural counties than in urban counties. She said that
119 the 6.5 million pounds collected in January and February were significantly more than
120 projected. For more information about the program go to

121 <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/eproductrecycle/>

122

123 In response to a question, Kiernan said that as a result of decreased tonnage and operational
124 improvements, Cedar Hills is now forecast to reach its permitted capacity in 2018. That
125 date could be extended as a result of a revised site development plan.

126

127 MSWMAC Updates

128 SWAC Member Joan McGilton reported that MSWMAC discussed the Collection and
129 Processing and WPR chapters at its meeting last week. The committee discussed the
130 overlap of content between the chapters. They also discussed what may be included in the
131 calculation of the 80 percent recycling goal set by Washington State's Beyond Waste
132 Implementation Work Group. The group discussed moving toward weekly yard waste
133 collection throughout the year with bi- weekly garbage collection, the difficulties in
134 increasing recycling in multi-family housing, and the disposition of shredded paper. They
135 discussed the need to define the terms used in the comp plan such as "Zero Waste of
136 Resources" and options to increase the visibility of waste prevention in the plan. They

137 heard public comment about the possibility of beneficial use and energy production from
138 garbage.

139

140 **Comp Plan Working Chapter Review: Collection & WPR chapters**

141 Kiernan noted that policies and recommendations have been moved to the front of the
142 chapters. The final draft will list the page number in the chapter showing the location of
143 discussion related to each recommendation.

144

145 Mele said that the language in WPR-1 could be read to imply that waste disposed in the
146 landfill is a beneficial use because the gas from the landfill is being used to create energy.
147 Kiernan responded that is not the intent of the language and that the discussion on page 7
148 addresses the topic.

149

150 Guest Jerry Hardebeck suggested that a policy be added to increase the sustainability of the
151 solid waste system. He said cities should consider the impact of traveling to transfer
152 stations on fuel consumption and road wear. Hardebeck suggested that the county consider
153 studying self-haul sustainability and share the results with the cities. Hardebeck said that
154 self-haul vehicles are not part of a sustainable system and suggested that mandatory service
155 be universal. McGilton responded that mandates have not been well received at
156 MSWMAC.

157

158 Gaisford said data shows most self-haul comes from customers that currently have curbside
159 pick-up disposing of bulky items. Severn noted that businesses such as “Got Junk” that
160 collect bulky items from multiple customers are also counted as self haulers.

161

162 Kiernan noted that sustainability is one of the topics discussed in the Environmental
163 Stewardship chapter and that a recommendation to implement a curbside bulky item
164 collection service is included in the Collection and Processing chapter. Crosby suggested
165 that customers be informed that bulk pick-up is currently available under WUTC
166 (Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission) tariffs. Crosby noted that collection
167 trucks fueled by natural gas do not emit Nitrogen Oxides.

168 Vice Chair Judy Stenberg suggested it may be valuable to do a fuel study to address this
169 point. McGilton noted that MSWMAC has not heard Hardebeck's ideas and perhaps system
170 sustainability could be discussed in a joint meeting.

171

172 In response to a comment, Gaisford noted that new collection standards are being
173 considered for Vashon because they have a different system than what is available in the
174 rest of unincorporated King County. Mele said that Washington State's Beyond Waste
175 working group has discussed phasing in a three-bin system across the state for organics,
176 recyclables, and residuals. Kiernan noted that idea is discussed on pages 6 and 7 of the
177 Collection and Processing chapter.

178

179 In response to a question, Kiernan said that after considering the comments received, the
180 chapters discussed at the meeting would be included in the draft plan. He noted that the
181 group will also review the Finance and Environmental Stewardship chapters.

182

183 The official 120-day comment period will begin upon distribution of the draft plan. Severn
184 noted that copies of the plan will be sent to public libraries, Unincorporated Area Councils,
185 the Health Department and the King County Council. The division is planning to
186 electronically distribute the plan as much as feasible in order to limit the cost of printing
187 and use of paper. When comments have been reviewed, the division will determine the
188 schedule for the next steps in completing the approval process.

189

190 McGilton asked what the division is doing to respond to MSWMAC's request concerning
191 increasing the emphasis on waste prevention in the WPR chapter. Kiernan responded that
192 the division is considering that request. Currently, each area of the chapter leads with a
193 discussion of waste prevention and separating it more definitely may inadvertently discount
194 the importance of recycling.

195

196 Gaisford noted that the Collection and Processing chapter includes a recommendation that
197 food waste be included in the yard waste and garbage collection be changed to every other

198 week. That program is in place in Renton. Crosby noted that the program has resulted in a
199 15 percent decrease in solid waste and a 7 percent increase in organics.

200

201 Casalini said that WPR-5 is supported by the Link Up program. Find more information
202 about the Link Up program at <http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/linkup/index.asp>.

203 Casalini said that it is important to link programs with processing facilities that have a local
204 market. Severn said that this is implied in the loop diagram inserted after page six of the
205 Collection and Processing chapter. Casalini noted it is also important to educate the public
206 resulting in decreased contamination of recycled materials and to encourage businesses to
207 invest in the technologies used to sort and process recyclables as discussed on page 29.

208

209 Gaisford noted that the county is making additional efforts to find the highest value end
210 uses for asphalt shingles and expanded polystyrene foam. He said that there is a
211 recommendation on page 4 of the WPR chapter that suggests the division develop a new
212 competitive grant program to help cities and collection companies with projects that help
213 meet plan goals.

214

215 Hardebeck suggested that cities consider a rate structure that separately reflects the cost of
216 garbage, recycling, and organics collection so residents can see that there is a cost for
217 collecting each material and that garbage collection costs the most.

218

219 In response to a comment about WPR-7, Kiernan said the division will do more analysis
220 when actual costs are known. Severn noted the analysis could consider the Jeff Morris
221 model which assigns a dollar value to environmental and social costs and benefits. Beck
222 said that WPR-7 could result in goals that are not economically sound. He suggested that
223 language be added that allows the goals to be re-evaluated when needed. Casalini suggested
224 WPR-7 also appear in the Financial and Environmental Stewardship chapters.

225

226 Gaisford said that prior to today's meeting, Whitley provided the Division with questions
227 and concerns about C&D recycling and disposal data. Gaisford acknowledged the feedback

228 and said the data will be corrected in the draft comp plan. MSWMAC members interested
229 in seeing the data prior to the release of the draft plan may contact Gaisford.

230

231 **Public Comment**

232 Robert Kommer from Summit Biofuels said that he sees inconsistency in the comp plan. He
233 heard a commitment to zero waste but sees the division building a system where the
234 majority of the funds will be spent to support trash compaction and landfilling. He said that
235 action is not consistent with the goal of zero waste.

236

237 Kommer said that the R.W. Beck report says the Bow Lake Transfer System upgrade is
238 preparing the facility for eventual out of county waste export. He said the county is not
239 willing to spend money on zero waste. He said that the county should change policies so
240 they are consistent with their actions or find industries that will come in to make capital
241 expenditures to support the policies. He asked the committee to respond to his comments
242 concerning the inconsistency of stated policies and how taxpayer dollars will be spent.

243

244 Stenberg responded that the solid waste system is funded by user fees, not tax dollars.

245 Kommer responded that users should know their dollars are going to compaction and
246 landfilling, not zero waste. Casalini said SWAC is a volunteer group that makes
247 recommendations, but does not make policy. He said that the public will have an
248 opportunity to comment on the draft plan when it is released.

249

250 Mele asked what Summit Biofuels would recommend adding to the Bow Lake Transfer
251 Station. Kommer said that the division should look very hard at other conversion
252 technologies that maximize materials recovery. He said the division should do an RFP to
253 look for other options. Mele responded that the county has looked at various options. The
254 bulk of them were some version of incineration and waste-to-energy. Kommer responded
255 that he had looked at the R.W. Beck report and said they have no experience with anaerobic
256 digestion. He said that anaerobic digestion is a commercially proven option.

257

258 **Adjourn**

259 The next meeting is scheduled for April 17th. The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

260

261 Submitted by:

262 Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff